

### **REMARKS**

With the foregoing amendment claims 1-3 are pending in the application. No new matter has been added by this amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Rejections/Objections, which are discussed below.

#### **The Rejection of Independent Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Independent claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Chesebro (US 4,519,128) in view of Baba (US 5,554,872). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner contends that it would be “obvious ... to modify the device of Chesebro ... as taught by Baba.” However, Baba does not provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the device of Chesebro so that it has a trench having a depth of 50-150  $\mu\text{m}$ . Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn because it is improper to combine references unless there is some suggestion or motivation to combine the references.

Baba does not provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the device of Chesebro so that the device employs a trench having a depth of 50-150  $\mu\text{m}$  because Baba states that it is impossible to create a trench having a depth of 30  $\mu\text{m}$  or more. Specifically, Baba states, “the depth of a trench must be set to be 30  $\mu\text{m}$  or more. The present trench technique cannot form this deep a trench. ... Consequently, an element having a high breakdown voltage cannot be obtained in practice.” *Baba, col. 2, ll. 40-49*. Accordingly, because Baba discloses that it is impossible to form a trench having a depth of 30  $\mu\text{m}$  or more, it necessarily and logically follows that Baba does not provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the device of Chesebro to employ a trench having a depth of 50-150  $\mu\text{m}$ .

Because Baba does not provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the device of Chesebro so that the device employs a trench having a depth of 50-150  $\mu\text{m}$ , Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

**New Claims**


New dependent claim 3 is added. Support for these new claims can be found at, for example, paragraph [0023] of US 2004/0094800.

Claim 3 is patentable over the art of record for the reasons give above with respect to claim 1. Additionally, claim 3 is patentable over the art of record because none of the cited references, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest that "the width of the trench is about 1/10 the depth of the trench," as is required by claim 3. Applicant respectfully requests that claim 3 be indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
NAME AND REG. NUMBER	Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276				
SIGNATURE				DATE	11/18/05
Address	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
City	Washington	State	D.C.	Zip Code	20005
Country	U.S.A.	Telephone	202-783-6040	Fax	202-783-6031